

some of these health care costs and while I would be first to agree the exact process suggested in 611 may be modified somewhat, it is one of the additional tools that the Legislature or the state can use in order to bring some ability to manage the cost of these health programs. So I would urge that you place the bill on General File, because when we get into the budget issues, or when we get into these deficit issues the need for this to address those problems are going to become much more apparent.

PRESIDENT: Thank you Senator Warner. Before we proceed I would like to announce that there is a statewide group with us this morning, 25 women who are representatives of the Tri-Diocesan Council of Catholic women, Mrs. Schmit, the wife of our Senator is in the group, with the chairperson Glayds Majkowski, Ida Wonderseck, Pat Twiehaus, Rosie Kwoda, they are presidents within the group and they are in the north balcony. We welcome you to our procedure. Also the Speaker would have me announce on Friday, the day when we are planned to be in recess, the Governor is having a guest, and you are invited to the reception at the Governor's Mansion, from three to five on Friday, April 1st. All Senators and their staff are invited to greet Professor Archibald Cox, formerly Solicitor General and Assistant Attorney General in the Watergate administration, Professor Cox. We will proceed to the continuation of the debate on the motion to place LB 611 on General File notwithstanding committee action. We will recognize Senator Fenger. Order in the Chamber please.

SENATOR FENGER: Thank you, Mr. President. I guess it is no secret that I would rise to oppose the revival of LB 611. It is in fact a carbon copy of LB 932 of last year. That bill was also kept in committee. I have a memorandum from committee council at that time on that bill to point out a couple of concerns. One of them in fact says that allowing the Director of Welfare to determine what services will be provided may be a delegation of legislative authority. So apparently that concern has been around about as long as the concept has. During the public hearing on LB 611 our committee heard fourteen opponents suggest that implementation of this bill could be counterproductive to the intent of the bill, because it does in fact have the potential of eliminating lower cost levels of health care services to eligible recipients. Just this morning every member of the committee received a letter from the Nebraska Association of County Officials. Interestingly enough, they support, and here I quote, the philosophy of LB 611. Not 611 itself. The rationale says that the Medicaid services in the State of Nebraska, while being optional, is more broad